



EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
09/086,857	05/29/98	FREDERICK		D	D-1093	
_		PM92/0409	\neg		EXAMINER	
RALPH E. JOCKE				BUTLE	R.M	
231 SOUTH BROADWAY				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MEDINA OH 4	4256			3651	19	
					04/09/01	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Notification of Non-Compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c)

÷

Application No. 09/086,857

Applica

Frederick et al.

Examiner

Michael E. Butl r

Group Art Unit 3651



The Appeal Brief filed on
1.192(a) for filing a new complete brief must be filed IN TRIPLICATE. See 37 GFR 1.192(a). appeal will be dismissed. The new complete brief must be filed IN TRIPLICATE. See 37 GFR 1.192(a).
 The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).
3. At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).
4. The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).
5. The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).
6. A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and a. the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, a. the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together,
b. the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
7. X). The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).
8. The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).
9. 🔀 Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):
Explanation in detailed action.
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper 140(3).
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413 ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Serial Number: 09/086857

Art Unit: 3651

DETAILED ACTION

Defective Appeal Brief

1. The appellant's 89 page "Brief" is defective for exceeding the principal brief size limit without receiving special leave from the Board to file an oversized "brief." The Federal Rules (of Appellate Procedure) provide a safe harbor limit for principal briefs of 30 pages. FED. R. App. P. 32 (7)(A); 28 U.S.C. Appendix. Alternately, appellants may certify brief volume to a maximum of 14,000 words or 1300 lines with a monofaced type. FED. R. App. P. 32 (7)(B & C); 28 U.S.C. Appendix. As a further alternative, the party may obtain special leave from the adjudicator. FED. R. App. P. 32, *Judicial Advisory Committee Annotations on Rule 32*.

The Administrative Procedures Act proscribes that unless a statute on point or an agency promulgated rule on point exists, the [Federal] Rules of Evidence and Procedure apply, 5 U.S.C. § 559. The United States Patent and Trademark Office is an administrative agency within the context of the Administrative Procedures Act, *Dickenson vs. Zurko*, 50 USPQ2d 1930, 1933; 527 U.S. 150 (1999). In his majority opinion, Justice Breyer held that § 559 generates uniform standards among the agencies. *Dickenson vs. Zurko* at 1935.

By way of example, a rule on point expressly superceding § 559 is the express page limit for briefs filed before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. 37 CFR § 2.128(b). Statutes superceding § 559 include other portions of the Administrative Procedures Act such as the standard of review expressly proscribed in 5 U.S.C. § 706 wherein the § 706 standard of review superceded implementation of Rule 52(A) as triggered via § 559. *Dickenson vs. Zurko* at 1932. There is no statutory limit within Titles 35 or 5 of the Code or Title 37 of the Rules on brief size before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. As there is no express rule or statute on

Serial Number: 09/086857

Art Unit: 3651

point limiting brief size, the 30 page safe harbor limit of Rule 32 applies unless a party is granted permission via special leave from the Board upon exercise of the Board's discretionary authority or unless party elects to certify volume as expressed in word count or line count.

When a party generates an oversized brief, he unduly burdens the adjudicator with excessive analysis and obscures the focus of the issues they need analyze and decide, thereby making the task of the adjudicator (in this instance, the Board) more difficult. As such, a party needs obtain permission from the adjudicator when burdening it with such an extra workload. Since applicant failed to obtain leave from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for the filing of an oversized brief, applicant's 89 page brief is defective.

As noted in the included annotated sections, the Judicial Advisory Committee wrote Rule 32(7) with its 14,000 word/1300 line limitations, toward a goal of proximating Rule 32 in word content with the 50 page limit of old Rule 28(G) of which it was replacing. Rule 28(G) was written at a time when briefs were generated on typewriters.

As a courtesy to applicant, the examiner includes for applicant's benefit the article warning that briefs certified with MS Word® may give erroneous word counts if the factory default options are not properly deselected-held to be inexcusable attorney misrepresentation.

2. Applicant has misstated the status of claims 46-47 with respect to rejections evidenced in whole or part by Higham et al. or Lavigne as having been withdrawn by the examiner. Only the rejections of claim 45 as evidenced by Higham et al.., the 102 rejection evidenced by Lavigne to claim 45, and the 103 rejection evidenced by Lavigne in view of Aten to claim 45 were withdrawn by the examiner. No rejections on claims 46 or 47 were withdrawn. In accord with 37 CFR 1.192 (8) (iii and iv) and MPEP § 1206, applicant's brief is defective. If applicant's intent is to concede these rejections, he need not address these rejections.

Art Unit: 3651

Conclusion

3. Appellant is required to comply with provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c) and Rule 32.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, Appellant must comply within the longest of any of the following TIME PERIODS: (1) ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS, whichever is longer, from the mailing of this communication; (2) within the time period for reply to the action from which appeal has been taken; or (3) within two months from the date of the notice of appeal under 37 CFR 1.191. Extensions of these time periods may be granted under 37 CFR 1.136.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Exmr. Michael E. Butler whose telephone number is (703) 308-8344.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Ellis, can be reached on (703) 308-2560. The fax number for the Group is (703) 305-7687.

۶.

Michael E. Doube

Michael E. Butler Examiner

CHRISTOPHER P. ELLIS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

1 f. Ull 3/27/01